```
NA25menC
     UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
1
     SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK
      -----x
 2
3
                                            New York, N.Y.
     UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,
                                             23 Cr. 490 (SHS)
 4
                V.
5
     ROBERT MENENDEZ,
     NADINE MENENDEZ,
6
     WAEL HANA,
     JOSE URIBE,
 7
     FRED DAIBES,
8
                    Defendants.
9
10
                                              October 18, 2023
                                              2:00 p.m.
11
12
     Before:
13
                          HON. SIDNEY H. STEIN,
14
                                              U.S. District Judge
15
16
17
                               APPEARANCES
18
     DAMIAN WILLIAMS
          United States Attorney for the
19
          Southern District of New York
     BY: PAUL M. MONTELEONI
20
          ELI J. MARK
          DANIEL C. RICHENTHAL
21
          Assistant United States Attorneys
22
     WINSTON & STRAWN, LLP
          Attorneys for Defendant Robert Menendez
     BY: DAVID A. KOLANSKY
23
24
               (Appearances continued next page)
25
```

1	APPEARANCES
2	SCHERTLER, ONORATO, MEAD & SEARS, LLP
3	Attorneys for Defendant Nadine Menendez BY: DANNY C. ONORATO
4	GIBBONS, P.C. Attorneys for Defendant Wael Hana
5	BY: LAWRENCE S. LUSTBERG ANNE M. COLLART
6	RICARDO SOLANO, JR.
7	KASOWITZ, BENSON, TORRES, LLP Attorneys for Defendant Jose Uribe
8	BY: MARC E. KASOWITZ DANIEL FETTERMAN
9	FRIA R. KERMANI
10	PAUL, WEISS, RIFKIND, WHARTON & GARRISON, LLP Attorneys for Defendant Fred Daibes
11	BY: ROBERTO FINZI -and-
12	ARLEO & DONOHUE, LLC BY: KAMRON SHARIF
13	ALSO PRESENT: Tracee Mergen, Special Agent (FBI)
14	Ryan Larkin, Special Agent (FBI)
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1	(Case called)

THE DEPUTY CLERK: Counsel, please state your names for the record.

MR. MONTELEONI: Good morning, Paul Monteleoni for the government. With me at counsel table are my colleagues, Eli Mark and Daniel Richenthal, as well as special agents Tracee Mergen and Ryan Larkin, from the FBI.

THE COURT: Good afternoon.

MR. KOLANSKY: Good afternoon, your Honor. David Kolansky from Winston & Strewn on behalf of Senator Menendez.

THE COURT: Good afternoon. You asked that Senator Menendez be excused, correct?

MR. KOLANSKY: Correct, your Honor.

THE COURT: I've granted that, and we have another date for his arraignment.

MR. KOLANSKY: Correct. Monday, your Honor.

THE COURT: All right. Thank you.

MR. ONORATO: Good afternoon, your Honor. Danny Onorato on behalf of Nadine Menendez, who is with me at counsel's table.

THE COURT: All right. Good afternoon.

MR. LUSTBERG: Good afternoon, your Honor. Lawrence S. Lustberg from Gibbons, P.C., on behalf of defendant Wael Hana. Mr. Hana is here. With me are my colleagues Anne Collart and Ricardo Solano.

25

1 THE COURT: All right. Good afternoon. 2 MR. KASOWITZ: Good afternoon, Marc Kasowitz, 3 Kasowitz, Benson & Torres for Mr. Uribe, and I have with me Dan 4 Fetterman. 5 MR. FETTERMAN: Good afternoon, your Honor. 6 THE COURT: All right. Good afternoon. 7 Mr. -- I'm sorry. Let's finish. 8 MR. FINZI: Good afternoon, your Honor. Roberto Finzi 9 for Fred Dabies, who is next to me here in court. Along with 10 me are Richard Carlo and Kamron Sharif. THE COURT: Good afternoon. Please be seated. 11 12 Mr. Kasowitz, your recently, and your firm entered a 13 notice of appearance here, correct, for Mr. Uribe? 14 MR. KASOWITZ: That's correct, your Honor. 15 THE COURT: Please make sure that you make contact with the classified information security person and file -- get 16 17 your application in for security clearance. That's the 18 classified information security officer. The government can 19 give you the name and the contact information. Try to get your 20 application or applications in this week if you can. 21 MR. KASOWITZ: We will do that, your Honor. 22 THE COURT: All right. Because everybody else already 23 has their applications in. 24 All right. Government, tell me what the status of

discovery is here. Let me tell you what my notes say:

the last time we met, you were waiting for the entry of a protective order. I entered that protective order on October 6.

You indicated that you then were going to produce documents that were intended to be among the highest priority documents on a searchable base, and then the next tranche was going to be the bulk of the documents that were obtained pursuant to grand jury subpoenas. It looks like that was pending a QC, which I take is a quality control review, so presumably that already is on its way. That's what my notes indicate.

Talk to me as to what is actually happening.

MR. MONTELEONI: Yes, your Honor.

We have been working diligently to produce discovery on the schedule set by the Court, and consistent with our discussion at the last conference to prioritize the most significant material first. Our productions so far cover more than 150,000 pages of documents, though that's a significant undercount, because it includes materials from 27 different electronic devices and accounts that did not lend themselves to full pagination.

So the first production that we talked about last time, we made that on October 6, the date the protective order was entered. That was about 77,000 pages of documents. The next week we produced responsive materials from two electronic

devices. That was on October 12. Then this week we produced responsive materials from 25 different accounts and devices, and that includes materials from devices and accounts that were used by four of the defendants.

This is a part of our rolling production of responsive materials that we've identified pursuant to the search warrants in this case. It's not all of the responsive material. Our review, as we discussed last time, continues, but consistent with the Court's directive to prioritize, we've made a very substantial production this week, including a number of communications between the defendants and between co-conspirators, material that we consider very significant to the trial of this action. It's not everything. It's not even everything significant. We think that it's going to tremendously assist counsel in the defense of this action.

THE COURT: Now, do I understand, because you originally told me you had approximately 50 electronic devices, are you saying that you've made the production of 29 of those 50 already?

MR. MONTELEONI: No. So we've made the production of responsive sets from two of the devices where the review is complete. That was last week on October 12. Then the next 25 devices are partial identifications of responsiveness material for devices where the review for those devices continues.

So we collected some of the material that we had

already identified as among the responsive material. However, we're continuing to review even those devices for additional responsive material. However -- as I said, I do believe that yesterday's production of this material was highly significant.

We've also produced to the defendants their own electronically stored information, with one or two exceptions, which we will, you know, get out to the defendants shortly. The large production that we discussed, that you referenced, we submitted that to our vendor following the quality control final checks that I talked about within two days of the conference. The vendor has been processing it, and as I understand it, is in the process of exporting it now. That production is 7.7 million pages, so that export process takes some time.

THE COURT: What is exporting?

MR. MONTELEONI: So exporting is moving it from the vendor's platform into a form in which we can then copy it to the defense. So that process, we think for a production of this volume, perhaps around half a terabyte, may take a little bit of time, but they are, essentially, almost done with what they need to do. So we'll have that 7.7 million pages out to the defense soon.

THE COURT: Well, can you put a timeframe on it?

MR. MONTELEONI: Based on the information I have -
THE COURT: If you can't, you can't.

MR. MONTELEONI: -- that I got from the vendor this morning, I can't; but I expect it's going to be soon. This is in the very late stages. It's just a very large project.

THE COURT: All right.

MR. MONTELEONI: These things take time.

And of course that's not everything. We're continuing both our responsiveness review of the devices and also our general productions of discoverable information, and we're targeting December 4th as you've directed.

THE COURT: Thank you.

I think it sounds like the government is definitely making a good faith effort to keep to the schedule, and it sounds like you're on schedule. Thank you.

Let me turn now to the bail application of Mr. Hana. As I understand it, this is document 78, Mr. Lustberg, what you're asking me for, you can correct me if I'm wrong, is the removal of the ankle bracelet, as a condition of pretrial release, from Mr. Hana; and you say that the GPS monitor's been extremely uncomfortable, and even painful for Mr. Hana over the past three weeks since it was applied.

Basically, you're requesting that the GPS monitor be removed because, if I understand correctly, he voluntarily returned here from Egypt; his wife and young daughters have applied for a visa to come here; he was residing in Egypt with them, but they've applied for a visa, and you expect them to

being coming here; and, thirdly, she's been scheduled for an interview with the U.S. Consulate, so you think it's going to happen soon.

Is that basically it? You tell me whatever you like, sir.

MR. LUSTBERG: Thank you, your Honor.

I think the Court has summarized it well. It's a pretty extraordinary case. Following Mr. Hana's indictment, when he was told about it, he immediately, and when I say immediately, within moments made flight reservations to come back here, even after the government informed us that he would be arrested at Kennedy Airport upon his arrival, he still came, and he did that notwithstanding that there's — he may not even be extraditable. He's here to face these charges. His family is joining him. He has a residence here. He has an office here.

I think the government's concern at the outset was perhaps when discovery began to come in, he would change his attitude about staying here. Discovery, as the Court has just -- per the colloquy that the Court just had with the government, we've begun to receive it. We've begun to go over it with him. He remains resolute about staying here.

Let me be clear that he has -- we're not asking for relief from any other conditions of his release. He has surrendered all travel documents. In fact, he found another

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

travel document, which we surrendered --

THE COURT: I saw.

MR. LUSTBERG: -- to pretrial just today. He's going nowhere. And the Court of course knows the standard. It should -- we believe that the GPS is a condition that's simply not necessary to secure his attendance at trial, or the safety of the community.

And it is uncomfortable. I mean, it buzzes all night while he's trying to sleep. It doesn't make it easy for him to be awake and alert when we meet with him. And I have this experience with other clients, I should say. It's just an inconvenient thing that he doesn't need. He has a curfew. He's willing to abide by that curfew. There are alternatives in terms of assuring that he does abide by that curfew, phone calls, or the like, with pretrial services. We're happy to work all that out. But this is just a -- it's an onerous condition that -- for sure it's not as onerous as being in custody, but it's an onerous condition that we just feel, respectfully, is not -- is just simply not necessary under these unique circumstances where he voluntarily returned to this country to face these charges, and has to remain here, because he has no ability to leave. So we would ask for that modest --

THE COURT: What do you mean has to remain here because he has no ability --

MR. LUSTBERG: Because he's surrendered all his documents — he has no passport. He has no travel documents. He has no way to leaving the country even if he wanted to. And there are other alternatives to assure that the government knows, or that pretrial knows his whereabouts, that don't require that he have this monitoring 24/7.

THE COURT: What are those?

MR. LUSTBERG: There could be phone calls. There could be random checks. There's all kinds of mechanisms. And we'd be happy to work with pretrial to work those out.

THE COURT: Let me ask you a couple of questions, and then I'll hear from the government.

I guess the first is a statement of the scores of people who have come before me, and had the GPS monitors applied, nobody has brought to my attention that it was extremely uncomfortable and even painful. That doesn't mean it wasn't uncomfortable. I'm just saying it's never risen to the level of anyone bringing it to my attention.

Is there something unusual here that I should know about?

MR. LUSTBERG: No. I mean, I've looked at this device. I've seen it on other people. I actually, your Honor, have had a similar experience to you, that often people don't complain about it, but in most cases the reason for that is they'd rather be on GPS monitoring than sitting in custody in

20

21

22

23

24

25

the Metropolitan Detention Center. 1 2 But here, his detention really was not in the cards, and our view is that it's gratuitous. It's, you know --3 4 THE COURT: Unnecessary, it's not the least 5 restrictive? 6 MR. LUSTBERG: Correct. 7 THE COURT: I understand. 8 Last question, you suggest he may not even be extraditable. I haven't read that extradition treaty with 9 10 Egypt, but at least according to your submission here he hasn't 11 been indicted for an extraditable crime according to this --12 what you've set forth. Is that true? 13 In other words, were he to go back to Egypt, where his 14 wife and children are, and I take it he's a citizen both of 15 Egypt and of the United States; is that correct? MR. LUSTBERG: Yes, your Honor. Yes. 16 17 THE COURT: Then at least according to what I have 18 here, he could not be extradited back here; is that correct?

MR. LUSTBERG: That's our -- that was the

information -- look, I've not done -- to be completely candid with the Court, I've not done a real deep dive.

THE COURT: I understand. You haven't parsed the treaty.

MR. LUSTBERG: I've literally looked at the list of offenses in the treaty, and the significance of it to us -- and

I would understand the Court's concern, that if he went back there, then it would be difficult to get ahold of him, but the truth is he knew that and came here. And so it goes to the good faith of his journey to the United States in order to face these charges, which he's looking to defending himself on and believes that he will be acquitted of.

THE COURT: What about a possible change of heart as this case proceeds?

MR. LUSTBERG: Well, even if he had a change of heart, it would be awfully difficult for him to leave without travel documents. Travel is limited, and his — and he's posted property. Presumably by then his family will be here as well, and so there are many other protections that are — that are in place to prevent that — to prevent his flight.

THE COURT: All right. Thank you.

Let me hear from the government.

MR. RICHENTHAL: Good afternoon, your Honor.

I want to start --

THE COURT: Tell me who you are, sir, so the record is clear.

MR. RICHENTHAL: Daniel Richenthal.

THE COURT: Yes, sir.

MR. RICHENTHAL: I just want to start briefly with the suggestion that the bracelet's uncomfortable. We accept in good faith that may be so, and we would encourage Mr. Lustberg

to work with his client and pretrial services to resolve it.

Maybe it can be moved to a different location. Maybe it can be moved to a different ankle. I don't know. But that aside, there's nothing in this application that is new or material or warrants this change.

And let me just step back for a second and talk about what this case is about as to Mr. Hana. I will note that pretrial services opposes the removal of the GPS, and we do as well, for multiple reasons. So Mr. Hana, according --

THE COURT: Well, I don't have that before me.

Pretrial services has opposed it in this case specifically?

MR. RICHENTHAL: This morning, your Honor, my colleague, Mr. Marks, spoke with the assigned pretrial services officer, and we were informed in sum that they oppose removal of the GPS.

THE COURT: All right.

MR. RICHENTHAL: I'm sure pretrial would be happy to speak to the Court if the Court has questions.

But, in sum, the reason we oppose it, and the reason we understand pretrial opposes it is Mr. Hana has, conservatively, in excess of \$25 million in net worth, the overwhelming majority of which is abroad in Egypt and in Uruguay, that includes multiple commercial properties. In each of those two countries at a minimum, he has commercial properties themselves worth millions of dollars, as well as

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

other assets. He is deeply connected, as alleged in the superseding indictment, to the Egyptian Government, and specifically to Egyptian intelligence officers.

So while we hope that Mr. Hana does not intend to flee the United States, were he to try to do so, common sense alone would tell you he might well have the assistance of folks to get him a passport, so the mere surrender of his travel documents is not sufficient. The reason we agreed to negotiate a bail package, and that's what this is, is that Mr. Hana returned voluntarily; but that agreement was predicated on two key things, and he's now proposing to remove the most important of the two, while not substituting anything in its place. Those two key things were a substantial bond, \$5 million, secured by both cash and assets. That's been done. And, and this is in our judgment the most important, GPS. And the reason it's most important is what I just said. He has tens of millions of dollars at his disposal outside the United States in two different countries. He's connected to a foreign government in general, and intelligence officers in particular. And in light of the superseding indictment, of which he was not aware at the time he came here, and which adds a new charge, and in light of discovery, of which he was not aware at the time he came here, his incentives, in our judgment, have markedly changed. For all those reasons, the Court should deny this application.

The only truly new information of everything I've said is this idea that his family may come here. I don't know if that's true. I don't know if it's not true. What I do know is it hasn't happened yet. So even if the Court were inclined to make some sort of modification on that basis, and we'd urge your Honor not to do so without at least some form of additional conditions, it's premature. At this stage, on this record, the condition should remain in place.

THE COURT: All right. Thank you.

Mr. Lustberg, did you want a quick reply?

MR. LUSTBERG: Yes. Very briefly, your Honor. It is an extraordinary thing --

THE COURT: What the U.S. Attorney was doing really was going to -- it seems to me, going to the possibility of a change of heart as things go forward.

MR. LUSTBERG: Your Honor, fair enough.

Your Honor, it's not appropriate for me to testify here about -- with regard to what Mr. Hana would say, but if you were to question him, what he would tell you is having reviewed the superseding indictment, having reviewed all of the discovery in this matter, understanding the breadth of the allegations and the scope of the proofs against him, he is absolutely resolute about staying here. He wishes to face the charges.

If the Court wishes to wait on this application, which

I don't think it needs to under the standard set forth in the Bail Reform Act, it could do so until his family actually gets here. Hopefully, that will be sooner rather than later.

THE COURT: Right.

MR. LUSTBERG: But, your Honor, he wants to face these charges. He specifically came to face these charges. He made those arrangements within moments of learning of the indictment.

THE COURT: No, I understand.

MR. LUSTBERG: I think you do understand, your Honor.

THE COURT: Yes.

MR. LUSTBERG: I won't repeat.

THE COURT: All right. Thank you.

I'm going to deny the application for removal of the GPS monitor. I have no doubt — I have no reason whatsoever to doubt Mr. Hana's desire to stay here in the United States and to face the charges against him. I accept that at face value. To what he says, I have no reason to doubt it. Nonetheless, in light of his substantial assets abroad, the fact that his family is abroad, the fact that he's an Egyptian citizen, the fact that, as far as the Court knows, it's not an extraditable offense with which he's been charged, I do find that the GPS monitor is part of the least restrictive conditions, or combination of conditions that will reasonably assure his appearance here in the United States. So I'm going to deny the

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

request for modification of bail.

Let's move on to the arraignment of four of the defendants on the superseding indictment, and then we'll proceed to the Curcio hearing. I think Mr. Lustberg foreshadowed that by saying he's not here to testify. So we'll get into that in the Curcio hearing.

Let's start then with Mrs. Menendez.

Mrs. Menendez, would you rise, please?

State your name, please.

DEFENDANT NADINE MENENDEZ: Nadine Menendez.

THE COURT: Mrs. Menendez, have you received a copy of the superseding indictment $S-1\ 23\ CR\ 490$ in this case?

DEFENDANT NADINE MENENDEZ: Yes, I have.

THE COURT: Have you read it?

DEFENDANT NADINE MENENDEZ: Yes, I have.

THE COURT: Did you discuss it with your attorney?

DEFENDANT NADINE MENENDEZ: Yes, I have.

THE COURT: Did he answer the questions, if any, that you had?

DEFENDANT NADINE MENENDEZ: Yes.

THE COURT: You have the right, Mrs. Menendez, to have me read that superseding indictment in open court. Similarly, you have the right to waive my reading, in which event I won't read it.

Do you want me to read it, or do you wish to waive the

1	reading of it?
2	DEFENDANT NADINE MENENDEZ: I wish to waive the
3	reading of it.
4	THE COURT: All right. I accept the waiver of the
5	right to have the superseding indictment read in open court.
6	How do you plead to the charges against you in that
7	superseding indictment, guilty or not guilty?
8	DEFENDANT NADINE MENENDEZ: Not guilty, your Honor.
9	THE COURT: I accept your plea of not guilty.
10	Thank you, Mrs. Menendez. You may be seated.
11	Mr. Hana.
12	DEFENDANT HANA: Yes, your Honor.
13	THE COURT: What is your name, sir?
14	DEFENDANT HANA: Wael Hana.
15	THE COURT: Have you received a copy of the
16	superseding indictment in this case?
17	DEFENDANT HANA: Yes, your Honor.
18	THE COURT: Did you read it?
19	DEFENDANT HANA: Yes, your Honor.
20	THE COURT: Did you discuss it with your attorney?
21	DEFENDANT HANA: Yes, your Honor.
22	THE COURT: Did he answer any questions you may have
23	had about it?
24	DEFENDANT HANA: Yes, your Honor.
25	THE COURT: You have the right to have me read that

```
superceding indictment, and if you don't want me to, I won't.
1
 2
      What's your pleasure?
 3
               DEFENDANT HANA: I don't want you to. Thank you.
 4
               THE COURT: All right. I accept that as a knowing and
5
      voluntary waiver of the right to have the superseding
6
      indictment read in open court.
 7
               How do you plead to the charges against you in that
      instrument, sir, guilty or not guilty?
8
9
               DEFENDANT HANA: Not guilty.
10
               THE COURT: I accept your plea of not quilty, sir.
               Thank you. You may be seated.
11
12
               DEFENDANT HANA:
                               Thank you, your Honor.
13
               THE COURT: Mr. Uribe. What is your full name, sir?
14
               DEFENDANT URIBE: Jose Uribe.
15
               THE COURT: Have you received a copy of the
16
      superseding indictment S-1 23 CR 490?
17
               DEFENDANT URIBE: Yes, your Honor.
18
               THE COURT: Did you read it, sir?
19
               DEFENDANT URIBE: Yes, your Honor.
20
               THE COURT: Did you discuss it with your attorney?
21
               DEFENDANT URIBE: Yes, your Honor.
22
               THE COURT: Did he answer any questions you may have
23
     had about it?
24
               DEFENDANT URIBE: Yes, your Honor.
25
               THE COURT: As you heard when I did the arraignment
```

```
for the other defendants, you have the right to have me read
1
 2
      that superseding indictment in open court, but if you don't
      want me to, I won't.
 3
 4
               What would you like?
 5
               DEFENDANT URIBE: I don't want you to, sir.
 6
               THE COURT: All right. I accept that as a knowing and
 7
      voluntary waiver of the right to have the superseding
8
      indictment read in open court.
9
               Mr. Uribe, how do you now plead to the charges against
10
      you in that superseding indictment, quilty or not quilty?
11
               DEFENDANT URIBE: Not quilty, your Honor.
12
               THE COURT: I accept your guilt -- your not guilty
13
     plea, sir. I accept your not quilty plea.
14
               Thank you. You may be seated.
15
               Now, when I was reading the indictment, I thought you
     pronounced your name Daibes, but apparently it's --
16
17
               DEFENDANT DAIBES: Daibes.
18
               THE COURT: Daibes. All right. Mr. Daibes, what is
19
      your full name, sir?
20
               DEFENDANT DAIBES: Fred Daibes.
21
               THE COURT: Mr. Daibes, have you received a copy of
22
      the superceding indictment S-1 23 CR 490?
23
               DEFENDANT DAIBES: Yes, sir.
24
               THE COURT: Did you read it, sir?
```

DEFENDANT DAIBES: Yes, I did.

1	THE COURT: Did you discuss it with your attorney?
2	DEFENDANT DAIBES: Yes, I did.
3	THE COURT: Did he answer any questions you may have
4	had about it?
5	DEFENDANT DAIBES: Yes, he did.
6	THE COURT: Now, as you've heard, you have the right
7	to have me read that instrument in open court.
8	Do you want me to read it or no?
9	DEFENDANT DAIBES: No, I do not.
10	THE COURT: All right. I accept that as a knowing and
11	voluntary waiver of the right to have the superseding
12	indictment read in open court.
13	How do you plead to the charges against you in the
14	superseding indictment, sir, guilty or not guilty?
15	DEFENDANT DAIBES: Not guilty.
16	THE COURT: I accept your plea of not guilty.
17	Thank you, Mr. Daibes. You may be seated.
18	All right. That is the arraignment on four of the
19	five defendants, and we have a date for the arraignment of
20	Mr. Menendez.
21	Let's now proceed to the Curcio hearing.
22	MR. MONTELEONI: Your Honor, before we proceed to the
23	Curcio
24	THE COURT: Yes.
	THE COURT: Yes. MR. MONTELEONI: may I make an application with

respect to the Speedy Trial Act? 1 2 THE COURT: Yes. 3 MR. MONTELEONI: The government moves to exclude the 4 time between now and the trial date of May 6, 2024, under the 5 Speedy Trial Act. We believe that this exclusion will be in 6 the interest of justice, because the exclusion would allow the 7 defendants to review the discovery that we have been producing and that we will be continuing to produce, to allow the 8 9 defendants to consider and file motions, and the parties to 10 prepare for trial, and potentially to discuss the disposition 11 of the case. 12 THE COURT: All right. Thank you. 13 I think we already have a Speedy Trial exclusion on 14 the record until then, but there's no harm in doing it again. 15 Let me hear the position of each of the defendants. 16 Mr. Menendez's attorney. 17 MR. KOLANSKY: Yes, your Honor. We have no objection to the exclusion of time. 18 THE COURT: Mrs. Menendez. 19 20 MR. ONORATO: Your Honor, again, no objection. 21 THE COURT: Mr. Hana. 22 MR. LUSTBERG: No objection, your Honor. Thank you. 23 THE COURT: Mr. Uribe. 24 MR. FETTERMAN: No objection, your Honor.

THE COURT: Mr. Daibes.

MR. FINZI: No objection, your Honor.

THE COURT: All right. With the government having moved for an exclusion of time from today until May 6 from calculation under the Speedy Trial Act, and with each of the defendants' attorneys stating that they have no objection, I hereby exclude time from today until May 6, 2024, from Speedy Trial Act calculation. I make the finding that this continuance serves to ensure the effective assistance of counsel, and to prevent any miscarriage of justice.

I also find that the ends of justice served by this continuance outweigh the best interest of the public and of each of the five defendants in a speedy trial. This is an (h)(7)(A), interest of justice, exclusion. The reason is to enable the government to continue its production of documents, and for the parties to attempt to resolve this consensually if they so desire.

All right. The exclusion is, again, from today until May 6 of next year.

All right. Let you now proceed to the Curcio hearing.

MR. FINZI: Your Honor.

THE COURT: Yes, sir.

MR. FINZI: I'm sorry. It is my understanding this is a separate proceeding, that the presence of all the other defendants isn't necessary.

THE COURT: That is correct. The other defendants do

```
NA25menC
      not have to stay.
1
2
               MR. FINZI: Okay. So I don't want to be
3
      disrespectful, but I'm going to advise my client that we can go
 4
      now.
5
               THE COURT: Good-bye. Come again, when summoned.
               (Adjourned)
6
 7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
```